

[Mr. T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai]. [11th December 1923]

disease to which my hon. Friend, Mr. Narasimha Raju, referred, I may say that this disease is called Red-rot and it became very prevalent in Godavari and Vizagapatam districts some years ago."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"With the sympathetic assurance given by the hon. the Minister for Development, I withdraw the Resolution."

The Resolution was by leave withdrawn.

The House then adjourned for lunch (at 1-30 p.m.) and re-assembled at 2-30 p.m.

POSTPONEMENT OF RESETTLEMENT OF BLACK SOIL TALUKS OF BELLARY
AND ANANTAPUR DISTRICTS.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, I beg to move the following resolution :—

6. *That this Council recommends to the Government that in modification of the orders contained in G.O. No. 1332, Revenue, dated 21st July 1922, the wet rates in the case of lands under first-class irrigation sources be enhanced by 5 per cent only with effect from fasli 1333, and that the remaining rates of assessment remain unaltered for the period of resettlement.*

"Sir, before going into the merits of the Resolution, I would just like to recapitulate briefly the circumstances under which this Resolution comes again before the Council this year. Resettlement operations were commenced in my district (Bellary) practically in the beginning of 1919 and continued up to 1920. A scheme was published by the special settlement officer wherein he proposed the enhancement of the land assessment of all lands under first-class irrigation sources by 25 per cent and of all wet lands of other sources by $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. With regard to dry lands he made a distinction between black soil and wet soil. As regards black soil lands, he proposed an increase of assessment by $18\frac{3}{4}$ per cent and of the other soil by $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. He had exempted from his report lands bearing the lowest assessment, viz., those bearing 4 annas assessment and under. After this report was published, the ryots of the four taluks of the Bellary district and two of the Anantapur district who were affected by the proposal of this settlement officer petitioned to the Government that these rates should not be given effect to and that they should be heard. In compliance with their request the hon. the Revenue Member, whose presence I miss to-day, was good enough to go over to Adoni and hear the ryots who waited in deputation on him. The hon. the Deputy President was one of those who headed the deputation along with some others and I, by their courtesy, happened to be their spokesman. I tried to show to the hon. the Revenue Member how any enhancement of assessment in those areas was untenable. Subsequently, in February, i.e., a month after the deputation waited on the hon. the Revenue Member, I tabled a Resolution in this House to the same effect. Then, the hon. the Revenue Member said that he had not time to go into the question fully, that the reports from his subordinate officers were just then in his hands and that he was not then in a position to come to any conclusion on the points raised by me. However, he was good enough to promise, if

11th December 1923] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

I remember rightly, that he was not going to increase the rates of assessment either in that fasli or even in the next fasli and that within that time he would consider my representations as far favourably as he could. With that assurance, I withdrew my Resolution. Two years passed by and then the Government were again trying to impose these additional rates. Then myself and my hon. Friend Mr. Siva Rao, each tabled a Resolution in this House to the effect that the proposed enhancement should not be carried out. By ballot, my hon. Colleague's Resolution came first and it was discussed in the Council. The wording of that Resolution was

'that these enhanced rates should not be given effect to.'

"The period for which these enhancements should not be given effect to was not specified and that was made one of the reasons by the hon. the Revenue Member to reject the Resolution. The discussion continued in a very sympathetic spirit, and I gratefully acknowledge the sympathy expressed by almost every hon. Member of the House then, many of whom I am glad to see, have been returned to this House. My hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar, said that perhaps it might be as well that we considered the matter a little more closely before we accepted the proposition then before the House *in toto*. He suggested as a *via media* that for one year these rates need not be brought into operation and that in the meanwhile some conclusion might be arrived at. Between the time we last met under the old regime and now, the Government have issued an order definitely telling us what rates should be increased and what not. Practically they confirm the proposals made by the special settlement officer with only one single exception which, in fact, does not amount to much at all. They exempt from the enhanced rates a low assessed class of land, viz., land bearing six annas assessment."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"May I ask to what Government Order the hon. Member has referred?"

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I am referring to the Government Order mentioned in my Resolution, viz., G.O. No. 1332, Revenue, dated 21st July 1922."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I may perhaps simplify discussion if I state that that order was not passed after the debate referred to by the hon. Mover."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I beg the hon. Member's pardon. I mean that the Government were initiating measures to bring the enhanced rates into operation without giving the Council the opportunity it wanted to pronounce an opinion on it. It may be within the knowledge of the hon. the Home Member, who is now in charge of settlement, that immediately after the rejection of the Resolution of the hon. Member, Mr. Siva Rao, I tabled another Resolution rectifying the defects noticed by the hon. the Revenue Member, wherein I mentioned that these rates should not be given effect to for a specified period of 30 years. That Resolution was admitted by the hon. the President and it was to come up for discussion before this Council, but in the meanwhile, the Government had issued orders to their subordinates in the district to prepare the *adangals* and other books so as to give effect to the proposals I have referred to above. That, I think, was hardly fair to the declared wishes of this House."

[Mr. T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai] [11th December 1923]

schemes before me, I cannot easily accept the proposition that a sugarcane farm should be opened in the Bellary district. For the information of my hon. Friend, the Mover of this Resolution, I may say that a special officer has been deputed to go into this question and on receipt of his report, if a case is made out for opening a farm in the Bellary district, it will be considered. As it is, I may tell him that the initial cost of opening a farm is about 2 lakhs of rupees and the recurring cost is Rs. 20,000. If money could be found by the Legislative Council, I should be the first to put the proposal of the hon. the Mover of this Resolution in advance of every other proposal. As things stand at present, I have no hopes of getting more money than what we are now getting. I entirely rely upon my hon. Friend to help me in the matter. For the present, he may be content with my assurance, viz., that the subject will receive my very sympathetic consideration, as I intend to tour in that district very shortly in the beginning of the next month. And if I am satisfied as to the necessity of establishing a sugarcane farm in that district, I shall bring up the matter when dealing with the budget proposals. For the present I must leave the matter in that stage."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" It is rather extraordinary that a statement should proceed from the hon. the Minister for Development that we, the non-official Members of this House, should find money to start sugarcane farms. I believe that it is his business to find the necessary funds. If he cannot find money to carry out his own policies, the non-official Members of this House should not be held responsible at all. He has stated that at Anakapalle the Government are going to open a sugarcane station at a cost of Rs. 30,000. It has nothing to do with the proposition before the House. Anakapalle has already got a sugarcane farm and Government propose to have a breeding station there. There is a breeding station at Coimbatore and it is maintained as an Imperial concern and most of the canes that are grown there are intended more for the Northern India sugarcane factories than for those of the Madras Presidency. Now, one who is acquainted with sugarcane cultivation will realize the necessity of having several varieties of sugarcane, that particular canes are suitable for particular climates and that the yields depend upon the quality of cane that is planted in a particular area. One who is acquainted with the Coimbatore breeding station can very well realize the enormous good that has accrued for the Northern India sugarcane stations. One who is acquainted with sugarcane cultivation will be convinced that a request to the Government to take up a similar concern for breeding good varieties of sugarcane necessary for the various climates of this Presidency is quite reasonable.

"The hon. the Minister for Development has stated that the Sugarcane Committee recommended a sugarcane circle for the Ceded districts. He has also, I think, given sufficient reasons for the establishment of a sugarcane factory at Hospet immediately. He also said that the ryots are not very industrious and that, consequently, the cultivation of the crop is very poor. I may state, Sir, that this is one of the reasons why, I think, my hon. Friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar has tabled his Resolution.

"One who has experience of the Anakapalle sugar farm can very easily realize the necessity of having varieties of sugarcane cultivated. Formerly the varieties that were cultivated in that farm were very poor, and were all

[10th December 1923]

V

AMENDMENTS TO STANDING ORDERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I have to inform the House that the following six gentlemen were nominated for election to the Select Committee to consider the amendments to Standing Orders 46 (1), 46 (2) and 49 (3) :—

Mr. K. Sitarama Reddiyar.	Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimha-
Khan Bahadur Haji Abd-ul-lah Haji	charlu.
Qasim Sahib Bahadur.	Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar.
Rao Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu.	Mr. C. Muttayya Mudaliyar.

“ As the number of candidates nominated for election is equal to the number of vacancies to be filled, namely, six, I hereby declare the above-mentioned gentlemen to be duly elected under Regulation II (4) of the Regulations for the holding of elections by means of the single transferable vote.

“ I have already informed the House that the Raja of Ramnad has been nominated as a Member of the Committee by me.”

VI

THE TUTICORIN PORT TRUST BILL, 1923.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I have to announce that I have appointed the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter, K.C.S.I., to be the Chairman of the Select Committee on the Tuticorin Port Trust Bill, 1923.”

VII

THE MADRAS STAGE CARRIAGES AND HACKNEY CARRIAGE
(AMENDMENT) BILL, 1923.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I have to announce that I have appointed the hon. Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar, C.I.E., to be the Chairman of the Select Committee on the Madras Stage Carriages and Hackney Carriage (Amendment) Bill, 1923.”

VIII

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ With reference to the motion passed at the meeting of the Council held on the 29th November 1923 in regard to the election of the Members of the Public Accounts Committee, I have to inform the House that with reference to Regulation II of the Regulations for the holding of elections by means of the single transferable vote, I fix 2 p.m. to-day as the time by which nominations of candidates should be sent to the Secretary.”

IX

HOUSE COMMITTEE.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ With reference to the motion passed at the meeting of the Council held on the 29th November 1923 in regard to the election of the Members to the House Committee, I have to inform the House that with reference to Regulation II of the Regulations for the holding of elections by means of the single transferable vote, I fix 2 p.m. to-day as the time by which nominations of candidates should be sent to the Secretary.”

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [11th December 1923]

the ryot gets more for the net produce of his land. Why should he not then pay a part of that to the Government as its due? That theoretically may be acceptable. But in actual application you will find that it is conformed to.

“There are certain well-known rules laid down for the guidance of settlement officers. No doubt the revision of assessment is said to be generally based upon the increase or decrease in the recorded prices of the staple grains of the tract. In our district paddy and cholam happen to be the staple products. They calculate the value of the produce of these lands in a particular way. Suppose a land gives a yield of a hundred measures of cholam. They have to estimate the value of the product from that land. For that they need a price. If cholam is selling at ten measures a rupee, then the value of the outturn will be only ten rupees and from that they have to deduct a certain amount for the merchant's profits, for cartage, for the vicissitudes of season, for unprofitable areas included in the land and cultivation expenses. After all these deductions are made, they divide the net balance into two parts and one part, that is one-half, represents the maximum amount to which the Government can lay claim. That is to say, if Rs. 10 represent the value of the outturn of a particular acre of land and Rs. 8 represent the sum total of all the deductions referred to above, you are left with two rupees and from that Government is entitled to claim not more than one rupee. If, on the other hand, they adopt the price of a famine year in which cholam was selling at five measures a rupee, they get as the value of the produce not ten rupees, but twenty rupees. And out of this twenty rupees if you deduct ten rupees for expenses, etc., you will be left with a net balance of ten rupees. Then the Government can claim up to a maximum of five rupees and not one rupee as before. That is the principle underlying the assessment. So, in order to fix the price, the Government have laid down the principle of striking an average for twenty non-famine years preceding the resettlement. Mark the words ‘non-famine’. They should be normal years. They should not be abnormal years in which the prices were exceptionally high for one reason or other. I respectfully submit that until they came to this unfortunate district they were more or less closely adhering to that principle. Take district after district. At Kurnool, Cuddapah, Chittoor and some taluks in Anantapur district they took the trouble of excluding for the purposes of striking the average price not merely the years in which there was actual famine, but also years in which officially there was no famine, but the prices were exceptionally high. Now I claim that the same thing should be done to the district of Bellary. I can give you the years in which the prices ruled high and were excluded in settling other districts and I claim that the same thing should be done in regard to my district as well. If you conform to that method you will find that the prices adopted by the Government for calculating the outturn are unduly high. They take the commutation price of Rs. 258 and if the principles they were professing hitherto are adopted now, they would not get such a high price, but it would be Rs. 225 or so. That means a reduction of about Rs. 30.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“Do I understand the hon. Member to say that he agrees to the commutation price of Rs. 225?”

11th December 1923]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ Out of that amount you will have to deduct the merchant's profit and things like that. In that case the commutation price will not show an increase of 62 and 53 per cent over the prices you took at the time of the last settlement. According to my calculation the percentage would not come to so much. Assuming, Sir, that the commutation prices calculated according to my proposition show an increase of 20 per cent over the previous prices, I say even then that could be no argument at all for enhancing the assessment. Why, you may ask? Again I refer to the principles enunciated by the Government. I submit, that supposing the present commutation price shows an increase of 20 per cent over the price at the time of the last settlement, you may argue that you are entitled to raise the assessment by 20 per cent. I say emphatically, ‘ No ’ in view of the principle you have hitherto accepted and acted upon. What are the instructions issued to settlement officers? They should not raise the rates to the full measure of the rise in prices because allowances made for increased cost of living, of labour, of stock and of implements, as well as for promoting a higher standard of comfort, should be liberal. That, I take it, was the reason why Government in their generosity did not increase the assessment by 58 per cent, but were satisfied with an increase of $18\frac{3}{4}$ or $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. They were good enough in their generosity to leave their claim for the difference between 58 per cent and $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent to provide for merchant's profit, for increasing the standard of living and other factors. If the assessment shows an increase of twenty per cent, there would be nothing left after allowing for merchant's profit, for increased comforts and for increased cost of living, etc., to justify the Government's enhancing the rate by any per cent whatsoever.

“ Again, Sir, there is one point which I would mention before I resume my seat. The Government assumes that the lands are yielding the same quantity of corn as they were supposed to yield at the time of the last settlement. I submit, Sir, in all seriousness and with a due sense of responsibility, that this is not the case.

“ I would only appeal to the Government to refer to the records of the crop experiments of their staff—of the revenue officials and
3 p.m. of the officers of the Agricultural department who were supposed to carry on the experiments more carefully than the revenue officials, and also to the various reports submitted by the Collector of the district, every year and every ten years and to see whether it is so or not. I have taken the trouble of collecting, as far as I could, figures showing the average outturns of these lands during the period between the last settlement and now. And I find that the return has never been so much as it is taken to be by the Government for settlement purposes. In fasli 1319, eight experiments were conducted with regard to the outturn and in four cases, the outturn showed an increase of 3, 6, 7 and 20 per cent respectively.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“ The increase of what? ”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ The increase of the outturn of cholam as compared with the estimated outturn at the old settlement. I must say here that I am referring to experiments on soils of eight annas and above, which are affected by the resettlement proposals. In the other four cases, Sir, there was a deficiency of 27, 33, 40 and 75 per cent. In the fasli 1320,

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [11th December 1923]

there were ten experiments ; in one the outturn was equal and in the remaining nine cases it was less by 20 to 70 per cent or on an average, by 44 per cent. In the fasli 1321, eight experiments were conducted and the outturn was less by 7 to 95 per cent. In 1322 again, I was able to get only a record relating to one experiment and it showed 32 per cent less. In 1323, there were five out of which I find one showing an excess of 5 per cent, while the others show a deficiency of 58, 66, 55 and 57 per cent respectively."

Mr. E. W. LEGH :—" May I ask the hon. Member what figures he is quoting ? The experiments are conducted on estimates. Generally speaking the crop is estimated at so many annas before the experiment and it is only after that that the crop is cut. The officers conducting the experiments proceed on the basis of the estimates and I expect the hon. Member would give us the estimate figures."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I am very glad that the hon. the Revenue Secretary wants more information on this point. Not that he wants the information, but that he wants it for others who may require it. The hon. Member knows well how these experiments are conducted. The officials select typical plots of land for conducting them. Ten cents of it are marked and when the time comes for harvest, a responsible official goes and has the harvest conducted in his presence and gets the grain collected measured and the quantity of grain so obtained from each plot is recorded in the crop experiment report. These reports are sent through the respective Divisional Officers to the Collector and I dare say the hon. the Revenue Secretary knows all these. I have taken the number of measures appearing in the old settlement report belonging to soils bearing particular assessment and class and so on and comparing them with the actual outturn on similar soils according to the crop-experiment reports, I find that these outturns are less in the way I have indicated."

Mr. E. W. LEGH :—" I have not got the information I wanted, Sir. The hon. Member has given figures after the crop-cutting experiments but has not given the anna estimate of these particular crops before the experiments."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I really do not understand the point of the hon. the Secretary. I submit that the land bearing a particular assessment has been marked in the last settlement report as expected to give a certain number of measures. I find that land of a similar sort bearing the same assessment gives a less quantity of grain now. I do not understand how it is in any way difficult to arrive at the actual excess or deficiency with reference to the estimated outturn. The experiments were first conducted by the Revenue department. Afterwards, as I said, the Agricultural department was entrusted with this task of finding out the average outturn of the various crops and I find that whatever the agency be, the result is equally unsatisfactory to the Government. If my figures are challenged, I am quite prepared to go further into this matter. The yield has become less ; the cost of cultivation, I beg to say, has increased more than the increase in the prices may lead you to think. Comparing the original price of cholam with the present prices, you may say that the cost of cultivation has during the last 30 years increased only by 58 per cent. But that is not so. The cost of cultivation has increased to an extent which is more than that by which the

11th December 1923] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

food-stuffs have increased in value. So that on the one hand you have a diminished outturn, and, on the other hand, you have an increase in the cost of cultivation. Therefore, Sir, I say that there is no justification whatsoever for the enhanced assessment. I have made an exception in the case of wet lands under first-class irrigation sources for obvious reasons because they are not subject to the same disadvantages as dry lands or other wet lands under precarious sources.

"There is only one point I wish to refer to before I conclude. The Settlement Officer has made a distinction between black-cotton soil and red soil. For the black soil lands he has proposed an enhancement by $18\frac{3}{4}$ per cent and for the red soil, by $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. He has not given any reason in the Resettlement Report for which he is responsible, but I find his successor has tried to find an explanation for it in another report. He says:

'The case of the black soil is however different. Heavy rain is required to prepare it for cultivation. When once the sowing is over much rain is not required to sustain the crop as the soil is retentive of moisture and the crop during the later stages is matured by the light showers or heavy dew which usually falls after the north-east monsoon.'

"It is just because of this difference in the soils that they were classified differently at the outset. Black soils come under the higher classes and the other soils come under lower classes. The comparative merits of the two classes of soils were taken into account at the original classification itself and the black soil bears a higher rate of assessment by virtue of this fact. Having already done that, to impose an additional burden now seems to me to be highly unfair. The district of Bellary is not the only district where you have black and red soils. In the resettlement of no other district have the Government made this distinction. Even in Bellary district where there are other taluks pending resettlement, the Settlement Officer, in his report relating to those other taluks, has not made this distinction. Because the distinction is untenable, he has treated both black and red cotton soils alike. In fact, I am afraid that in Bellary district black-cotton soil suffers sometimes even more seriously than the red soil. Here is what is said by one Collector and by the Settlement Officer:

'The cultivation of the black-cotton soil depends entirely on the rains that fall from August to November; if these are deficient, the land is left waste. This is why black soils suffer most in times of prolonged and severe drought.'

"That is the story of the black-cotton soils which the Government are trying to make out to be so superior to the red soils as to deserve to be doubly and trebly penalized.

"I believe, Sir, I have said enough to convince the House that the proposed enhancement is unjustifiable. When this subject was discussed last year, I said we were on the eve of a famine, a year has passed by and I am very sorry to say that we are again on the brink of a famine, and the Collector has, I think, already sent his proposals for starting test works. I appeal to the hon. Members of this House on whichever side they may be to look at this point from a broad point of view, without minding me as the individual who has brought forward this Resolution and realize the difficulties of the ryots who are standing behind and who will be seriously affected by the resettlement proposals if given effect to and wholeheartedly support my proposition. I appeal to them for justice and nothing more."

[11th December 1923]

Mr. ABDUL HYE SAHIB :—" I rise to second the Motion. The hon. Mover has explained that just at this time when we are expecting some concession in the matter of assessment, at the time when we are dying out of famine, when we have not got even enough water to drink in Bellary, the Government have thought it fit to increase the assessment. It looks to me something like Nero's fiddling while Rome was burning. I have got the full support to the Proposition from all my hon. Friends of the Muhammadan party and, with these words, I strongly support the Motion."

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—" I rise to move my Amendent, Sir."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—" May I ask, Sir, if the hon. Member has given sufficient notice of the Amendment which he now proposes to move? If notice was given late, I object under Standing Order 60."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Do I understand that the hon. Member, Mr. Siva Rao, admits that he gave notice of the Amendment too late?"

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—" I gave notice yesterday, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member has not given two clear days' notice."

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—" Sir, with the leave of the House and with the permission of the hon. the President I can move the Amendment."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member can move the Amendment if the President suspends the Standing Order."

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—" I request the hon. the President to suspend the Standing Order."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I hereby suspend the operation of Standing Order 60 (1) so far as notice is concerned."

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—" Mr. President, Sir, I have the honour to move the following Amendment :—

'For all the words beginning with "in modification of the orders" substitute "the G.O. No. 1332, Revenue, dated 21st July 1922, may not be enforced until the principles of land revenue settlement are codified and placed on a legislative basis."'

"The Motion as amended will read :

'That this Council recommends to the Government that the G.O. No. 1332, Revenue, dated 21st July 1922, may not be enforced until the principles of land revenue settlement are codified and placed on a legislative basis.'

"Sir, if I am fortunate enough to carry this Motion through this House, we need not discuss the original Proposition on its merits. We need not discuss the reasonableness or otherwise of the rates proposed or sanctioned in G.O. No. 1332. Having said so much, I may say that for a very long time past, people of our Presidency have had no voice whatever in shaping our revenue policy. Taxation, Sir, all this time has been levied in the guise of land revenue assessment without reference to the wishes of the people, by executive action without consulting the Legislative Councils of the provinces. This disclosed a very unsatisfactory state of things. The matter was agitated

11th December 1923] [Mr. P. Siva Rao]

from time to time and the attention of the Decentralization Commission was forcibly drawn to this question as early as 1909 and they came to this conclusion. After an elaborate inquiry they said :

' We consider that the general principles of assessment, such for instance as the principle of net profits from the land which the Government shall be entitled to take and the period of settlement should be embodied in provincial legislation instead of being left to executive order as is now the case outside Bombay '

" Now, Sir, I see no action whatever has been taken so far as this Presidency is concerned in respect of that strong recommendation of the Decentralization Commission. The matter again came up in 1919 to 1920 before the Joint Select Committee of both Houses of Parliament, and, after a long inquiry and on hearing evidences, they came to the following conclusion :

3-15 p.m. ' The Committee are impressed by the objections raised by many witnesses to the manner in which certain classes of taxation can be levied upon the people of India by executive action without in some cases any statutory limitation and in other cases without adequate description by statute of the method of assessment.'

" And further on they said that the imposition of new burdens should be gradually brought under the purview of the Legislature, and, without expressing any judgment on the question whether land revenue is a tax or rent, they advised, and strongly advised too, that the process of revising land revenue assessment ought to be brought under compulsory regulation by statute. And then they say that

' no branch of the administration is regulated with greater elaboration and care but the people who are affected by it have no voice in it. . . . the rules are often obscure and are but imperfectly understood by those who pay the revenue. . . . The Committee are of opinion that the time has come to embody into law the main principles by which the land revenue is determined, the methods of revision, the pitch of assessment, the periods of revision, the gradation of enhancements and other processes that touch on the well-being of the people.'

" These are the very clear recommendations, and in accordance with these recommendations I had the privilege to move in this House, as early as January 1921, that the principles of land revenue settlement should be codified and placed on a legislative basis. That Resolution of mine, after a full-dress debate in the Reformed Council, was passed by an overwhelming majority. I remember very well that we took a day or two over the discussion of this question, and, excepting the official members, all others voted in support of that Resolution. And then the Government were graciously pleased to accept or act upon the principle of that Resolution. They appointed a committee of leading officials and non-officials to consider the best lines on which legislation should proceed, and I had the honour of serving on that Committee. It met for several days at Ootacamund and passed several resolutions. I do not think I would be out of order if I disclose to the hon. Members of this House one of the important resolutions we passed after a lengthy discussion in that Committee. It was that hereafter all resettlement proposals should receive the positive sanction of the Legislative Council."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—" May I ask, Sir, whether the papers he is quoting from are published papers, or whether the hon. Member is prepared to publish them ? "

Mr. P. SIVA RAO :—" I think, Sir, the Report of that Committee was placed on the Editors' Table and we all received copies thereof."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—" My information is that it was not."

[11th December 1923]

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"What is the recommendation which the hon. Member is reading from?"

Mr. P. SIVA RAO:—"The recommendation is that hereafter all the resettlement proposals that may be made by the Government should be placed before the Legislative Council for their affirmative sanction. That recommendation is contained in the Report of the Land Revenue Resettlement Committee which met at Ootacamund."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I do not quite understand the point of order raised by the hon. Mr. Knapp."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"May I just explain, Sir? I understood from the remarks of my hon. Friend, Mr. Siva Rao, that he was referring to the Proceedings of the Land Revenue Resettlement Committee, and I wanted to know from him whether they were published papers, or whether he was prepared to publish them. I think I am entitled to raise that question when he is quoting from papers not before the House."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Is it an official document?"

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I do not know, Sir. He is quoting from some documents, and I wanted to know if it was a published document, or if he is prepared to publish it."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member is aware that the obligation not to quote from document which a Member is not prepared to publish, lies only on the Members of the Government. It does not apply to private Members. Does it?"

Mr. P. SIVA RAO:—"To the best of my recollection it does not apply to private Members."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I believe, Sir, that it applies to any Member of the House."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The idea is that the Government when it acts in the general interest, is in a position to quote. But a private Member may even quote from private letters written to him without publishing the names. But, of course, the fact that he is not able to publish his authority is a matter which hon. Members may take into consideration in weighing the importance of what is stated. But I think the hon. Member is theoretically entitled to quote from all sorts of documents which nobody knows anything of. I hope he will not take advantage of this ruling and go on quoting from irrelevant documents."

Mr. P. SIVA RAO:—"I am quoting from the Proceedings of the Land Revenue Resettlement Committee, and one of the most important Resolutions passed by that Committee was that hereafter all resettlement proposals or proposals for increase or enhancement of land revenue should be placed for the positive sanction of the Legislative Council. Another important Resolution was that hereafter there should not be any larger increase than 12½ per cent at a time. All these important resolutions were passed and were embodied in a draft Bill, and to the best of my recollection the Bill also was ready for being introduced into the Legislative Council. Just then this House was pleased to pass a Resolution in favour of permanent settlement, and, as that question cropped up, the original question of codifying the

11th December 1923]

[Mr. P. Siva Rao]

principles of land revenue settlement was held up for the time being, and both the matters were referred to the Secretary of State for India, as I understood from the replies given to my interpellations. Then, Sir, I understand that the proposal of this House in favour of permanent settlement has been turned down by the authorities. That is my information, Sir, but I am open to correction. This Bill never saw the light of day. They never tried to introduce it into the Legislative Council, though they acted on it in the first instance and gave a distinct pledge to this House that they accepted the principle of that Resolution which was moved by me in the Legislative Council. They undertook to introduce a Bill embodying the principles of land revenue assessment. Now, Sir, over two years have elapsed without any action whatever being taken on this matter by the Government. And now all of a sudden they want to introduce these rates, not merely in Anantapur and Bellary, but in several other districts also. I would respectfully ask hon. Members of this House what has become of the Resolution passed by an overwhelming majority? Should we not request the Government to pay due respect to a resolution which they undertook to carry out? It requires a very strong explanation on their part as to why the question of the codification of the principles of land revenue assessment has been shelved. It may be said on the other side, 'We cannot say when that legislation can be undertaken or finished. It may take months or years'. It may take a few months, Sir, and I do not think any more time is necessary. The whole matter is ready, and the Bill has been drafted. What is required to be done by the Government is to announce the introduction of the proposed Bill in the Legislative Council. But it is no concern of mine whether it takes years or months. So far as we are concerned, we are determined and resolved not to entertain any proposals of resettlement till we have got those principles codified. We do not recede from that position and ask Government to give effect to our former Resolution. And until they do so, we cannot possibly sanction these proposals which have been approved only by the Executive Government. Now, if the principles are embodied in a Bill, it will affect this particular Government Order and this particular question in more than one way. For instance, if the recommendation be that there should not be any increase over 12½ per cent at a time, that is bound to affect the Government Order in question. When the principles are once codified, we should apply them to this particular question and then see whether those principles are adopted or not. Without taking up any more time of the Council, I would commend this Motion for the acceptance of the House for the main reason that we shall be stultifying ourselves and paying scant courtesy to a Resolution passed by ourselves at the very first meeting of the Reformed Council by an overwhelming majority if we allow the Executive Government to introduce these rates which have not been approved of by the Legislative Council."

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI:—"Sir, I beg to second this Amendment."

Mr. E. W. LEGH:—"Mr. President, Sir, I request you to give a ruling as to whether the Resolution that was originally moved or the Amendment that has just been moved is now before the House. Last evening, after the meeting of this Council, I was sitting in my room working, and at about

[Mr. E. W. Legh]

[11th December 1923.]

six o'clock or half past six, was put into my hand a notice of this Amendment. Now, Sir, there has not been time either to consult the hon. Member in charge of this portfolio, nor has there been time for him to consult his Colleagues on this Amendment which, Sir, I should like to point out, is entirely different from the original Motion. It is, I can say, almost a negative of the original Motion, and therefore I am not prepared to speak on the Amendment. I should like to know, Sir, whether I am entitled to give a reply to the original Motion which was moved by Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The Amendment having been moved but not having been adopted by the House, the discussion now will have to proceed on the Amendment, and then, if it is adopted by the House, the amended Resolution will hold the field. If it is thrown out, then of course we go on the original Motion. If the hon. Member finds that he is not prepared to go on with the debate, I believe there are other provisions in the Standing Orders open to him by means of which he can procure an adjournment of the particular Motion to another day."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I understand, Sir, that at present we are discussing the question whether Mr. Siva Rao's Amendment should be substituted for the original Resolution. He said that if we discuss the Amendment there will be no need to discuss the original Resolution. In other words, his Amendment is contradictory to the original Motion, or is a negative of it."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"If it is merely a negative of the original Motion, I would not have admitted it. But I quite agree with the hon. Member, Mr. Knapp, that if this Amendment is carried, it may be needless to consider the original Resolution in its original form. That is why I have allowed this Amendment to be taken up first, although it is third in the list."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"In regard to this particular matter of the Amendment, Sir, the hon. the Revenue Secretary has already explained that the notice that we have received has been very short indeed. However, there is no reason on that ground why we should now ask for an adjournment. There is no doubt there may be other hon. Members of this House who wish to support the hon. Mover of the Amendment, and if they are going to do so, I should be content that the question of this Amendment be put to the sense of the House. If the House decides on division to advise Government to stop this resettlement pending legislation, I am prepared to ask for an adjournment. But if they do not do so, I am prepared to meet the original Mover on his Resolution."

The Amendment of Mr. P. Siva Rao was then put to the House and carried.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The Motion now before the House is:—

That this Council recommends to the Government that the G.O. No. 1332, Revenue, dated 21st July 1922, may not be enforced until the principles of land revenue settlement are codified and placed on a legislative basis.

"That is the amended Motion and those who wish to speak on that may do so."

11th December 1923]

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"May I ask, Sir, what becomes of the other two Amendments which we expected would come in later?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The answer to that will be given after this Motion is disposed of. We have got the amended Motion now before the House."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I only ask for information, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"For the information of the hon. Member I may tell him that if he reads the amendments of Mr. Sitarama Reddi and Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar, he will see that they are entirely out of place with this Motion before the House. For instance, Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar says:

'Omit the words beginning with wet rates'.

"In the amended Motion, we don't have the words 'wet rates' at all. Similarly, Mr. Sitarama Reddi says:

'In line 4 for the figure "5".'

but, as a matter of fact, the line 4 has disappeared in the amended Motion. So that the other two amendment Motions have completely fallen out."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"That being so, Sir, I should like, if I may, to ask you that further debate on the amended Motion may be adjourned to some other day on the ground of short notice. We have had in fact no notice."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"To what date does the hon. Member want it to be adjourned?"

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I do not know for how many days the House is going to sit, Sir. Perhaps, the day after to-morrow may suit."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think the hon. Member had better formally move it."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"I beg to move, Sir, that the further discussion of this Motion be adjourned to Thursday morning."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"I second it."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The Motion before the House is that further consideration of this Motion of Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, as amended by Mr. Siva Rao, be adjourned to Thursday morning."

The Motion was put and carried.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I shall have it put in the Agenda on Thursday morning."

APPOINTMENT OF A DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF AGRICULTURE AS PRINCIPAL
OF THE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"The Resolution which I now move, Sir, runs as follows:—

6. *That this Council recommends to the Government that one of the Deputy Directors of Agriculture who is a graduate in Agriculture and possesses the necessary district experience be appointed as the Principal of the Agricultural College at Coimbatore.*

"Sir, the office of the Principal has hitherto been held by one who has had large district experience and who had been connected with the agricultural